

REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated January 9, 2008, which set a three-month period for response, making this amendment due by April 9, 2008.

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the claims were objected to for various informalities. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8-9, 14, and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,455,764 to Meihofer. Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meihofer. Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meihofer in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,278,489 to Bowers. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meihofer in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,200,648 to Vyas. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meihofer in view of U.S. PG Pub 2002/0171581A1 to Sheynblat. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meihofer as applied to claim 9 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,740,211 to Bedrosian. Claims 11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meihofer and Bedrosian and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,300,096 to Hall. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meihofer and Bowers and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,278,921 to Medding. Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Meihofer in view of Hall. Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meihofer in view of Medding. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meihofer in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,368,394 to Naimer. Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meihofer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,284,167 to Fujikawa. Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meihofer and Bedrosian and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,886,680 to Tindall. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meihofer and Bedrosian and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,343,549 to Tokiwa.

Turning first to the objections to the claims, the claims have been amended to address the noted objections. However, regarding the objection to the “angular position” in line 5, the Applicant respectfully submits that proper antecedent basis does indeed exist, because “a (desired) angular position” is recited in the first instance on line 2 of claim 1.

Claim 12 has been amended to address the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph.

With regard to claim 9, this claim was amended to refer back to claim 1 with regard to the “conversion” defined therein, specifically, the conversion of a chronologically changing datum of the angular position of a leading axle position into a pulse train.

Looking now at the substantive rejections of the claims, the Applicant respectfully disagrees that the primary reference to Meihofer discloses all of the

features of independent claim 1. Specifically, claim 1 as amended defines the feature that *the circuit is configured to be parameterized with regard to a number of pulses per rotation ($n/2\pi$)*. In the analysis of claim 1 on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner does not discuss this feature of claim 1 in connection with the Meihofner reference. Indeed, Meihofner does not disclose that his circuit can be parameterized with regard to a number of pulses per rotation.

The fact that the number of pulses per rotation can be configured cannot be derived from the portions of Meihofner discussed by the Examiner in the Office Action, especially the portions of the reference relating to the conversion of the changing datum.

Meihofner relates to a register control, for example, for registering marks on a printing web. The present invention relates to a drive device comprising a coupling unit (circuit) that is used to interface a subassembly of a printing press to the printing press itself. Since the subassemblies and the printing press can be produced by different suppliers, their connection interfaces sometimes are not consistent. The present invention enables the user of a printing press to be more flexible regarding the acquisition of subassemblies from different suppliers, since the present invention enables the user of the printing press to adapt the signals delivered by the printing press axle via parameterization to the interface requirements of the subassemblies, or vice versa.

Because Meihofner fails to disclose this feature of claim 1, the rejection under Section 102 cannot stand. Meihofner therefore is not a proper reference under 35 USC 102 pursuant to the guidelines set forth in the last paragraph of

MPEP section 2131, where it is stated that “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference”, and that “the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim”.

Likewise, independent method claim 24 includes the language relating to the parameterization of the number of pulses per rotation, so that like claim 1, claim 24 also is allowable over Meihofer by inclusion of the feature that is not disclosed by the reference.

Since the remaining dependent claims each depend ultimately from claim 1, and therefore include all of the features of claim 1, these claims also are patentable and non-obvious on the same basis.

The application in its amended state is believed to be in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael J. Striker', is written over the typed name.

Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 27233
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631-549-4700